

JUL 20 2007

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. The Examiner has objected to claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Additionally, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,805 to House in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,136,908 to Cline.

Claims 1-20 are Not Obvious Over House and Cline

A prima facie case of obviousness requires a showing that all of the claim limitations of the rejected claims are taught or suggested by the prior art. Manual of Patent Examining Procedure 2143 and 2143.03. "All words of a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Claims 1-20 are not obvious over the combination of House and Cline because the combination fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicants' claims. Specifically, the combination of House and Cline fails to teach or suggest transmitting data concerning a service directory in an existing customer computer network to an integrated computer network being built for the customer, the data used to configure the integrated computer network, as required by the claims of the present invention.

The Examiner cites House as teaching an online build-to-order system in which a customer is able to place an order for a network. (Office Action, p.2) The Examiner likens the online configuration mentioned briefly in House at column 16, line 41 to establishing a communication link and transferring data but acknowledges that House fails to teach transferring data concerning a service directory. (Office Action, p.2) At best, House discloses network-based methods and systems for the configuration of test, automation and measurement systems, but

never specifically citing built-to-order networks. (House, Abstract) Additionally, House fails to teach or suggest service directories, and thus fails to teach or suggest transmitting data concerning a service directory in an existing customer computer network to an integrated network being built for the customer, in order to configure the integrated computer network to work with the existing customer network. The Examiner cites Cline as teaching transferring a service directory from one network to another in claims 1 and 12-14 of Cline. (Office Action, p.2) However, Cline fails to remedy the deficiencies of House. At best, Cline teaches a customer or client who wishes to purchase a service and browses a **service directory located on a vendor's server**. (Cline, 3:23-24) The only service directory taught by Cline is located at the **vendor**, not the customer, and it is browsed by a customer in order to select services. Cline fails to teach or suggest a service directory **located at a customer** and thus fails to teach or suggest transmitting data concerning a customer service directory to an integrated computer network being built for the customer, the data used to configure the integrated computer network, as required by the claims of the present invention.

Because the above elements of the independent claims are not shown by the combination of House and Cline, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established. As such, the independent claims and all base claims which depend therefrom should be passed to issuance.

JUL 20 2007

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-20 of the present invention are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that these claims be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger Fulghum
Registration No. 39,678

Baker Botts L.L.P.
910 Louisiana
One Shell Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
(713) 229-1707

Baker Botts Docket Number: 016295.1575

Date: July 20, 2007